



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,732	04/08/2004	Yasuyuki Kawashima	11333/38	1524

7590 02/12/2009
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

EXAMINER

SRIVASTAVA, KAILASH C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1657

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/12/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/821,732

Applicant(s)

KAWASHIMA, YASUYUKI

Examiner

Kailash C. Srivastava

Art Unit

1657

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kailash C. Srivastava, Examiner. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Gregory H. Zaiya, Applicant's Representative. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 09 February 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: NONE.

Claim(s) discussed: Those of Record in the response filed 08 September 2008.

Identification of prior art discussed: That of Record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative and the Examiner discussed ways to overcome written description rejection to currently pending Claims 11-21 and 25-26 in view of Applicant's response filed to Patent and Trademark Office (i.e., USPTO) on 08 September 2008. The Examiner suggested to the Representative an amendment to the currently presented Claims 19-21 and 25-26 to incorporate the language (e.g., "display") consistent with that presented in the originally presented and currently amended specification filed 08 September 2008. The suggestion is to incorporate language (i.e., "display") from the specification, including that in the currently presented description from figures (e.g., Figure 10) in place of / or addition to currently presented language, "output" as written in the currently presented Claims 19-21 and 25-26. This suggestion is to bring said claims in a better condition for allowance, especially when considered in the context of claimed subject matter in the independent Claim 11. Said allowance, however, is pending another appropriate search for the prior art and further approval from the patentability conference at the USPTO. The Representative has declined Examiner's suggestion and asked the Examiner to send a written Office Action, even if said Office Action would constitute maintaining the currently placed "written description" rejection. Said requested Office Action will be issued in due course.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Kailash C Srivastava/
Examiner, Art Unit 1657